

Validation of Metals for the Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) based on  
SOW ILMO5.3 (SOP Revision 13)



PREPARED BY: Hanif Sheikh Date: 12-08-06

Hanif Sheikh, Chemist  
Hazardous Waste Support Section

Peer Reviewed by: Russell Arnone Date: 12-08-06

Russell Arnone, Chemist  
Hazardous Waste Support Section

Concurred by: Linda M. Mauel Date: 12/8/06

Linda Mauel, Chief  
Hazardous Waste Support Section

Approved by: Robert Runyon Date: 12/8/06

Robert Runyon, Chief  
Hazardous Waste Support Branch

Annual Review

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Sept. 2006

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Subject</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Scope .....	1
Contract Compliance Review .....	1
-Completeness.....	1
-Compliance .....	1
-Contract Compliance Screening.....	2, 11
Contractual qualifiers.....	5
Technical Review .....	2
Raw data .....	3, 17
QA/QC Acceptance Criteria .....	3
Data Validation Flags .....	3
Data Review Narrative.....	4, 47
Computer-Aided Data Review and Evaluation .....	5
PES Based Data Validation Strategy .....	6
Sampling Trip Report .....	10, 15
Telephone Record Log .....	10, 50
Request for Re-Analysis Form .....	10, 53
CLP Data Assessment Summary Form .....	10, 54
Data Review Log .....	10
Record of Communication .....	11
Forward Paper Work .....	11
Acronyms.....	12
Inorganic Target Analyte List and Contract Required Quantitation Limits.....	13
Chain of Custody/Sample Traffic Report .....	15
Cover Page .....	16
SDG Narrative , DC-1 & DC-2 Form.....	16
Raw Data .....	17
Technical Holding Time .....	18
Final Data Correctness .....	19
Initial Calibration .....	21
Initial and Continuing Calibration Verification .....	22
CRQL Standard Analysis .....	23
Initial and Continuing Calibration Blanks .....	25
Preparation Blank .....	26
ICP-AES/ICP-MS Interference Check Sample .....	28
Spiked Sample Recovery .....	30

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Sept. 2006

---

Lab Duplicates .....	33
Field Duplicates .....	36, 51
Laboratory Control Sample .....	38
ICP-AES/ICP-MS Serial Dilution .....	40
Dissolved/Total or Inorganic/Total Analytes .....	41, 52
Field Blank .....	42
Verification of Instrumental Parameters .....	43
ICP-MS Tune Analysis .....	44
ICP-MS Internal Standards .....	45
Percent Solids .....	46
Inorganic Data Review Narrative (Appendix A.2).....	47
Telephone Record Log (Appendix A.3).....	50
Field Duplicates Form (appendix A.4).....	51
Total/Dissolved Concentrations Form (Appendix A.5).....	52
Re-Analysis Request/Approval Record Form (Appendix A.6).....	53
Data Assessment Summary Form (Appendix A.7).....	54

## I.0 **Scope**

- I.1 This Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) applies to the evaluation of Routine Analytical Services (RAS) inorganic data generated in accordance with the EPA Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) protocols.
- 1.2 This Region 2 inorganic data validation SOP is used to determine the usability of analytical data generated from water and soil/sediment samples collected from Superfund sites in EPA Region 2.
- 1.3 Data should be generated and validated in accordance with the site specific Project Quality Objectives (PQOs) developed prior to the sample collection event. This SOP can be customized to validate the data according to the site specific PQOs. If the site specific DQOs are not available, this SOP must be used in its entirety.
- 1.4 This SOP is based, for the most part, upon analytical and quality assurance requirements specified in the Statement of Work SOW-ILM05.3, as well as in the final (October 2004) of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review. The SOP Checklist, Appendix A.1, provides guidance in conducting the data validation. The result of the use of this SOP is a **Total Review** of the data: **Technical plus Contract - Compliance Review**.

## 2.0 **Contract Compliance Review**

This type of review is the first step in data validation which is carried out to ensure that the CLP laboratory has analyzed the environmental samples in accordance with the Statement of Work (SOW), and provided a data package which is both complete and compliant. This means that laboratory's procedures were performed exactly as specified in the CLP Statement of Works (SOW) and the data package contains all the deliverables including the information required under the contract.

### 2.1 **Completeness**

The data validator must check the entire data package to ensure that all deliverables required under the CLP contract are present and legible. In addition, copies of the Contract Compliance Screening (CCS) report, re-submittal from the laboratory, and Regional documentation should also be present in the data package. In Region 2, the data package completeness check is currently performed by the Regional Sample Control Coordinator (RSCC) for each Sample Delivery Group (SDG). The data package is not released to the data validator until all the required deliverables are received from the laboratory.

### 2.2 **Compliance**

The data validator must check to ensure that all steps from sample receipt through sample preparation, analysis, data calculation and reporting are documented, and the information/data required under the contract is present in the appropriate reporting Forms and laboratory logs.

### 2.3 **Contract Compliance Screening (CCS)**

This screening step essentially checks the data package for the Completeness and Compliance requirements, and is performed by the Sample Management Office (SMO) currently operated by Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC), an EPA contractor. The CCS Report outlines the incomplete and non-compliant items as "Defects" in the data package, and is sent to the laboratory which is required to

provide additional or missing information/data required under the contract. The CCS Report for each SDG is transmitted electronically by the SMO to the Regional office. The CCS Report is intended to aid the data validator in locating any problems, both corrected and uncorrected. The incorrect original deliverable(s) of the data package must be replaced by the re-submittal(s) received from the laboratory in response to the CCS Report. The data validation should, however, be carried out even if the CCS Report is not available.

Web-based CCS is available for CLP laboratories to check their data prior to its delivery to EPA.

### 3.0 **Technical Review**

Technical review of the RAS data is carried out on the complete and compliant data to ensure its **validity** (i.e., data is of known quality and scientifically valid) and **usability** (i.e., data set is sufficiently complete and of sufficient quality to support a decision or an action described in the specific objectives of a data collection activity). The technical review process provides information on analytical limitations of data, if any, based on specific Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) criteria. This is accomplished by performing an in-depth review of both the field deliverables which document the field sampling activities, and the laboratory analytical data deliverables which document the laboratory activities carried out to generate the reported data. Essentially, the validator shall first ensure that the data package is complete and compliant. The validator shall then evaluate data/information on all these deliverables (Final data sheets, Forms for QC analyses Chain-of-Custody/Traffic Report Forms, raw data, etc.) against the QA/QC acceptance criteria specified in the SOP "Checklist" (Appendix A.1). The validator must answer each question in the "Checklist" and take an appropriate action as required under "Action" to qualify the data. As a result of the technical review, the data validator may qualify some of the data as **rejected** or as **estimated**. The data validator shall write a **Data Review Narrative** documenting the qualified data and the reason(s) for the qualification.

- 3.1 If the **raw data** necessary to support the reported results are not provided, the data validation must not be performed. The laboratory must be contacted to obtain missing raw data.
- 3.2 If batch quality control analyses are performed on samples other than **site specific samples**, data must not be validated or at best be considered as estimated. The data user must be notified of this action.
- 3.3 **QA/QC Acceptance Criteria**  
In order that reviews be consistent among reviewers, QA/QC protocol (stated in Appendix A.1) should be strictly adhered to. If a lab provides more than one set of QC analyses or more than one particular QC analysis for an SDG, the validator shall use the worst QC analysis to evaluate the SDG data. Professional judgement should only be used in the rare instances not addressed in the "Checklist".

### 3.4 **Data Validation Flags**

Three types of data validation flags (J, R & U) are used in Region 2 to qualify the data.

#### 3.4.1 **Flag “R” indicates Rejected Data**

Sample results determined to be unacceptable must preferably be lined over and flagged “R” with a red pencil only on the Inorganic Analysis Data Sheets (CLP Form I’s). Data rejected on the basis of an unacceptable QC analysis should be excluded from further review or consideration. Data are rejected when associated QC analysis results exceed the expanded control limits of the QC criteria. The rejected data are known to contain significant errors based on documented information. The data user **must not** use the rejected data to make environmental decisions.

#### 3.4.2 **Flag “J” indicates Estimated Data**

Sample results determined to be estimated must be flagged “J” with a red pencil only on the CLP Form I’s. Data are flagged (J) when a QC analysis falls outside the primary acceptance limits. The qualified “J” data are not excluded from further review or consideration. However, only one flag (J) is applied to a sample result even though several associated QC analyses may fail. The “J” data may be biased high or low.

#### 3.4.3 **Flag “U” indicates Non-Detects**

Sample results  $\geq$  MDL associated with a contaminated blank are flagged “U” with a red pencil only on Form I’s.

### 4.0 **Contractual Qualifiers**

The CLP laboratory applies contractual qualifiers on all Form I’s and the QC Forms when QC analyses are outside the control limits. These qualifiers are not applied on the Lotus or XLS spreadsheets with the exception of U and J. The contractual qualifiers and their meanings are as follows:

N : This qualifier indicates the lack of accuracy in the reported result, and is applied when matrix spiked sample recovery is outside the control limits.

E : This qualifier indicates the presence of interference, and is applied when the ICP serial dilution analysis is outside the control limits.

\* : This qualifier indicates the lack of precision, and is applied to sample results on Form I’s and Form VI when the Lab Duplicate analysis is outside the control limits.

U : This is a concentration qualifier that laboratory applies to a non-detected result which is essentially less than the Method Detection Limit(MDL). A non-detected result of an analysis is indicated by the Contract Required Quantitation Limit (CRQL) of that analyze suffixed with “U”.

J : This is a concentration qualifier that the laboratory applies to a positive result below the CRQL (i.e.,  $\geq$ MDL but  $<$ CRQL).

**NOTE:** The laboratory qualifiers are crossed out and replaced with the appropriate data validation qualifiers (J, R or U) by the data validator.

#### 4.0 **Rounding Rule**

The data reviewer must follow the standard practice to round off percent recoveries on the QC reporting forms.

#### 5.0 **Data Review Narrative (Appendix A.2)**

The data review narrative should be written using the format of Appendix A.2. The narrative should indicate the QC analyses outside the acceptance limits and the actions taken to qualify the associated data. The narrative should be prepared on a Personal Computer or a typewriter. If hand-written, under no circumstances should a pencil be used to write the narrative. The Data Review Narrative should be written in four (4) Sections: (i) Data Case Description, (ii) Complete SDG File (CSF) Audit Section, (iii) Technical Review Section, and (iv) Contract-Problems/Non-Compliance Section.

##### 5.1 **Data Case Description Section**

The data validator must briefly describe the data case in this Section, outlining important information such as the number of samples, their matrix, sampling date(s), analysis (TAL metals, mercury or cyanide), samples used for QC analyses, Field Blank(s), Field Duplicates, etc.

##### 5.2 **Complete SDG File (CSF) Audit Section**

The data validator must perform an audit on each SDG in the data package to ensure that all SDG-specific documents (sampling, samples shipping and receiving, telephone contact logs, etc.) are present in the data case. The audit shall also discover any discrepancy in the deliverables. In Region 2, this audit is currently performed by the ESAT data validator and its findings reported under "Comments" on a CSF inventory checklist. The validator informs the CLP Project Officer (PO) of the missing or additional information/deliverable required for data validation. The PO then contacts the lab for the desired deliverable/information. The findings of the CSF audit are reported in the CSF Section of the Data Review Narrative (Appendix A.2).

##### 5.3 **Technical Review Section**

The data validator shall report in this Section only the rejected (R) and estimated data (J) and the data rendered non-detects (U) as a result of technical review. It is imperative that the data reviewer **highlights** (i) QC analysis criteria applied to reject (R) or flag (J, U) the data, (ii) Samples rejected (R) or flagged (J, U), and (iii) the QC analysis out of control limits. The rest of the data that are not qualified (rejected or estimated) are not reported in this Section, and should be considered **fully useable**.

##### 5.4 **Contract-Problems/Non-Compliance Section**

All the CLP non-compliant items detected during data review must be reported in this Section.

## 6.0 **Computer-Aided Data Review and Evaluation (CADRE)**

CADRE is a computer program that performs semi-automated Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) checks of results from the chemical analysis of soil and water samples according to the CLP protocols. After the CADRE data qualification is complete, a Lotus 1,2,3 spreadsheet or an XLS spreadsheet with data validation qualifiers (R,J,U) is generated for each SDG. Currently, Sample Management Office (SMO) performs this task using Data Assessment Tool (DAT), a software-driven process, and forwards to the Regions the customized electronic spreadsheets (Lotus 1,2,3 or XLS spreadsheet) and QC reports via the DART (Data Assessment Rapid Transmittal) system. Manual data validation is performed in conjunction with electronic data validation which can only be done by a trained and experienced data validator. The manual data review complements CADRE's findings to complete an assessment of data quality in a shorter time than by a solely manual process. The data validator must review the XLS or Lotus 1,2,3 spreadsheet against Form I's to ensure that the same results on Form I's and the Spreadsheet are qualified with the same data validation qualifiers. The spreadsheet for each SDG is provided with the Data Review Narrative.

## 7.0 **Performance Evaluation Sample(PES)Based Data Validation Strategy**

### 7.1 **Scope and Summary**

This strategy offers the use of Performance Evaluation Samples (PES) in the data validation process as a means of ensuring the quality of the CLP data while significantly reducing the validation time. The single blind PES provided by EPA (or any other reputable firm) is analyzed with samples of each matrix in a Sample Delivery Group (SDG). A software program (e.g., PEAC TOOLS, SPS Web or equivalent) is used to determine whether or not the PES results fall within the previously statistically determined acceptance limits ("Action Low" and "Action High") for the Contaminants of Concern (**COC**). The PES results falling within the Action Limits are considered as acceptable results and may be designated as "Passed" analytes, and results of the analytes falling outside the Action Limits are considered as unacceptable and may be designated as "Failed" analytes. In either case ("Passed" Analytes or "Failed" analytes), the associated data is validated according to the Region 2 data validation SOP HW-2 in conjunction with the latest version of the WinCadre QC reports. The following strategy (procedure) is used:

### 7.2 **"Passed" COC**

If the COC in an SDG are within statistically generated Action Limits, the data validation is conducted according to QC analyses indicated by check marks (√) in the "Review COC For" column of the Table I. The SDG samples are validated using the Region 2 data validation SOP in



conjunction with the latest version of the WinCADRE QC reports. The validation flags (J, R, U) are applied on Form I's as well on the CADRE Lotus 1,2,3 or XLS spreadsheet. Corrections, if needed, are then made on the Lotus or XLS spreadsheet to ensure that all results on Form I's carry the same data validation and concentration flags as are on the Lotus or XLS Spreadsheet.

### 7.3    **"Failed" COC**

If the COC in an SDG are not within the statistically generated Action Limits, the data validation is conducted according to the data validation SOP QC Criteria indicated by check marks (✓) in the "Review COC For" column of Table II. The SDG samples are validated using the Region 2 data validation SOP in conjunction with the latest version of the WinCADRE QC reports. The data validation flags (J,R,U) are applied on Form I's as well on the CADRE Lotus 1,2,3 or XLS Spreadsheet. Corrections, if needed, are then made on the Lotus or XLS spreadsheet to ensure that all results on Form I's carry the same data validation and concentration flags as are on the Lotus or XLS Spreadsheet.

### 7.4    **COC "Not Evaluated"**

Acceptance limits for the analytes not present/spiked in the PE sample are not provided on the PES Scoring Evaluation Report. Such analytes will be marked as "Not Evaluated" in the PES Evaluation Column. These analytes will be validated much the same way as the "Failed Analytes".

The failed analytes and the analytes not present/spiked in the PE sample require data validation according to the QC criteria specified in Table II, and are identified by the TOPO in the TDF for the Case/SDG.

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Sept. 2006

**Table I**

Passed PES - All Contaminants of Concern are within the limits  
(Action Low  $\leq$  PES Result  $\leq$  Action High)

QC Criteria	Review COC for
Holding Time & Preservation	√
Initial Calibration	
Initial Calibration Verification	
CRQL Standard	√
Blanks-Initial & Continuing	
Preparation Blank	
ICP Interference Check Sample	
Pre- Digestion/Distillation Matrix Spike	
Post Digestion Spike	
Laboratory Duplicate	
Field Duplicates Comparison	√
Lab Control Sample	
ICP Serial Dilution	
Field Blank Contamination	√
Percent Solids	√
Transcription/Computation Check	
Raw Data	
Total vs. Dissolved Concentrations Comparison	√

- The CSF (Complete SDG File) audit will be completed before the PES validation strategy is applied.
- Comparison of the Lotus or XLS Spreadsheet must be after the PES validation strategy is applied. The Contract
- Compliance can be checked after the PES validation strategy is applied.

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Sept. 2006

**Table II**

**Failed PES - Contaminants of Concern are not within the limits**

(PES Result  $\leq$  Action Low, PES Result  $\geq$  Action High **OR** The Limits Not Established)

QC Criteria	Review COC for
Holding Time & Preservation	√
Initial Calibration	
Initial Calibration Verification	
CRQL Standard	√
Blanks-Initial & Continuing	
Preparation Blank	√
ICP Interference Check Sample	
Pre- Digestion/Distillation Matrix Spike	√
Post Digestion Spike	
Laboratory Duplicate	√
Field Duplicates Comparison	√
Lab Control Sample	√
ICP Serial Dilution	√
Field Blank Contamination	√
Percent Solids	√
Transcription/Computation Check	√
Raw Data	
Total vs. Dissolved Concentrations Comparison	√

- The CSF (Complete SDG File) audit will be completed before the PES validation strategy is applied.
- Comparison of the Lotus or XLS Spreadsheet must be after the PES validation strategy is applied.
- The Contract Compliance can be checked after the PES validation strategy is applied.

**8.0    Sampling Trip Report**

The sampler prepares a Sampling Trip Report for each sampling event and sends it to the RSCC. The report provides details of all activities performed for each sampling event on the Superfund site. It also lists the field QC samples such as Field Duplicates, Field/Rinse Blanks, sampling time and date for each sample, and samples associated with each field/rinse blank. The validator must use this information to evaluate the Field Duplicate pairs as well as the samples associated with contaminated Field/Rinse Blanks.

**9.0    Telephone Record Log (Appendix A.3)**

A Telephone Record Log (Appendix A.3) must be written by the data validator when a deliverable is missing or a clarification is needed about a lab procedure. The data validator should outline a basic profile of the Case on the Telephone Record Log Form, clearly indicating the reason(s) for inquiry and forward this Form to CLP PO/TOPO who will contact the lab to receive the missing document or information. The original Telephone Record Log is kept in the data package and a copy attached to the Data Review Narrative.

**10.0    Request for Re-Analysis (Appendix A.6)**

Data validator must note all items of contract non-compliance in the Data Review Narrative. If holding times and sample storage times have not been exceeded, the Project Officer (PO) may request re-analysis if items of non-compliance are critical to data assessment. Requests are to be made on "CLP Re-Analysis Request/Approval Record" form (Appendix A.4).

**11.0    CLP Data Assessment Summary Form (Appendix A.7)**

Fill in the total number of analytes performed by different methods and the number of analytes rejected (R) or flagged (J) as estimated due to corresponding quality control criteria. Place an "X" in boxes wherever analyses were not performed, or criteria do not apply.

**12.0    Data Review Log:**

It is recommended that the data validator maintain a log of the reviews completed to document:

- a. Case number
- b. SDG # (s)
- c. number of samples
- d. matrix of samples
- e. contract laboratory
- f. site name
- g. start-date of the data case review
- h. completion-date of the data case review
- i. actual hours spent
- j. reviewer's signature

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Sept. 2006

---

**13.0 Record of Communication -**

This is a Regional document prepared and provided by the RSCC for each data package. The ROC indicates the Case #, site name, samples and sample matrix and the laboratory name. The presence of a ROC in a data package is an indication that the package has been reviewed by the RSCC for completeness and is ready for data validation.

**14.0 Forwarded Paperwork**

Upon completion of review, the following are to be forwarded to EPA for final review:

- a. Data package
- b. Completed data assessment checklist (Appendix A.1, original)
- c. Original and a copy of completed data review narrative Appendix A.2)
- d. CLASS Contract Compliance Screening (CCS) report
- e. Telephone Record Log (Appendix A.3)
- f. Field Duplicates Form (Appendix A.4)
- g. Total/Dissolved Concentrations Form  
(Appendix A.5)
- h. CLP Re-analysis Request/Approval Record Form (Appendix A.6)
- i. Data Assessment Summary Form (Appendix A.7)
- j. CADRE Spreadsheet on a computer diskette.

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Sept. 2006

**ACRONYMS**

<b>AA</b>	Atomic Absorption
<b>AOC</b>	Analytical Operations/Data Quality Center
<b>CADRE</b>	Computer-Aided Data Review and Evaluation
<b>CCB</b>	Continuing Calibration Blank
<b>CCS</b>	Contract Compliance Screening
<b>CCV</b>	Continuing Calibration Verification
<b>CLP</b>	Contract Laboratory Program
<b>CO</b>	Contracting Officer
<b>COC</b>	Contaminants of Concern
<b>CRI</b>	CRQL Check Standard
<b>CRQL</b>	Contract Required Quantitation Limit
<b>CSF</b>	Complete SDG File
<b>CVAA</b>	Cold Vapor AA
<b>DART</b>	Data Assessment Rapid Transmittal
<b>DAT</b>	Data Assessment Tool
<b>DF</b>	Dilution Factor
<b>DQO</b>	Data Quality Objective
<b>ICB</b>	Initial Calibration Blank
<b>ICP</b>	Inductively Coupled Plasma
<b>ICP-AES</b>	Inductively Coupled Plasma - Atomic Emission Spectroscopy
<b>ICP-MS</b>	Inductively Coupled Plasma - Mass Spectrometry
<b>ICS</b>	Interference Check Sample
<b>ICV</b>	Initial Calibration Verification
<b>LCS</b>	Laboratory Control Sample
<b>LRS</b>	Linear Range Sample
<b>MDL</b>	Method Detection Limit
<b>NIST</b>	National Institute of Standards and Technology
<b>OERR</b>	Office of Emergency and Remedial Response
<b>OSWER</b>	Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response
<b>PB</b>	Preparation Blank
<b>PE</b>	Performance Evaluation
<b>%D</b>	Percent Difference
<b>%R</b>	Percent Recovery
<b>%RI</b>	Percent Relative Intensity
<b>%RSD</b>	Percent Relative Standard Deviation
<b>%S</b>	Percent Solids
<b>PO</b>	Project Officer
<b>QA</b>	Quality Assurance
<b>QAPP</b>	Quality Assurance Project Plan
<b>QC</b>	Quality Control
<b>RPD</b>	Relative Percent Difference
<b>RSCC</b>	Regional Sample Control Center

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Sept. 2006

**SDG** Sample Delivery Group  
**SMO** Sample Management Office  
**SOP** Standard Operating Procedure  
**SOW** Statement of Work  
**TAL** Target Analyze List  
**TR/COC** Traffic Report/Chain of Custody Documentation

## Inorganic Target Analyze List And Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CRQLs)

Analyze	CAS Number	ICP-AES CRQL	ICP-AES CRQL	ICP-MS CRQL
		Water Ug/L	Soil mg/kg	Water Ug/L
Aluminum	7429-90-5	200	20	---
Antimony	7440-36-0	60	6	2
Arsenic	7440-38-2	10	1	1
Barium	7440-39-3	200	20	10
Beryllium	7440-41-7	5	0.5	1
Cadmium	7440-43-9	5	0.5	1
Calcium	7440-70-2	5000	500	-----
Chromium	7440-47-3	10	1	2
Cobalt	7440-48-4	50	5	1
Copper	7440-50-8	25	2.5	2
Iron	7439-89-6	100	10	----
Lead	7439-92-1	10	1	1
Magnesium	7439-95-4	5000	500	-----
Manganese	7439-96-5	15	1.5	1
Mercury	7439-97-6	0.2	0.1	---
Nickel	7440-02-0	40	4	1
Potassium	7440-09-7	5000	500	-----
Selenium	7782-49-2	35	3.5	5
Silver	7440-22-4	10	1	1
Sodium	7440-23-5	5000	500	-----
Thallium	7440-28-0	25	2.5	1
Vanadium	7440-62-2	50	5	1
Zinc	7440-66-6	60	6	2
Cyanide	57-12-5	10	2.5	----

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
**USEPA Region 2**  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

---

**Site:**

**Case #:**

**SDG #:**

**Samples:**

**Soil**

**Water**



Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES    NO    N/A

**A.I.1    Contract Compliance Screening Report**

Present?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:**    If no, contact RSCC/PO.

**A.I.2    Record of Communication (from RSCC)**

Present?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:**    If no, request from the RSCC.

**A.I.3    Sampling Trip Report**

Present and complete?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:**    If no, contact RSCC/PO.

**A.I.4    Chain of Custody/Sample Traffic Report**

Present?

[ ]    —    —

Legible?

[ ]    —    —

Signature of sample custodian  
present?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:** If no, contact RSCC/WAM/PO.

**A.I.5    Cover Page**

Present?

[ ]    —    —

Is the Cover Page properly filled in  
and the verbatim signed by the lab  
manager or the manager's designee?

[ ]    —    —

Do the sample identification numbers  
on the Cover Page agree with sample  
Identification numbers on:

(a) Traffic Report Sheet?

[ ]    —    —

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

(b) Form I's?

[ ]    —    —

Is the number of samples on the Cover  
Page the same as the number of  
samples on the Traffic Report sheet  
and the Regional Record of Communication  
(ROC) for the data Case?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, prepare  
Telephone Record Log and contact RSCC/PO  
for re-submittal of the corrected Cover Page  
from the laboratory.

**A.1.6 SDG Narrative, DC-1 & DC-2 Form**

Is the SDG Narrative present?

[ ]    —    —

Is Sample Log-In Sheet(Form DC-1)  
present and complete?

[ ]    —    —

Is Complete SDG Inventory Sheet(Form DC-2)  
present and complete?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:**

If no, write in the Contract-Problems/  
Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review  
Narrative.

**A.1.7 Form I to XV**

A.1.7.1    Are all the Form I through Form XV  
labeled with:

Laboratory Name?

[ ]    —    —

Laboratory Code?

[ ]    —    —

RAS/Non-RAS Case No.?

[ ]    —    —

SDG No.?

[ ]    —    —

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

Contract No.?

[ ]    —    —

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, note under Contract Problem/Non-Compliance Section of the "Data Review Narrative" and contact PO for corrected Form(s) from the laboratory.

A.1.7.2      After comparing values on Forms I-IX against the raw data, do any computation/transcription errors exceed 10% of the reported values on the Forms for:

(a) all analytes analyzed by ICP-AES?

— [ ] —

(b) all analytes analyzed by ICP-MS?

— [ ] —

(c) Mercury?

— [ ] —

(d) Cyanide?

— [ ] —

**ACTION:**

If yes, prepare Telephone Record Log and contact CLP PO/TOPO for the corrected data from the laboratory.

**A.1.8 Raw Data**

**Data shall not be validated without the hard/electronic copies of the associated raw data for samples and QC samples.**

**A.1.8.1      Digestion/Distillation Log**

Digestion Log for ICP-AES  
(Form XII) present?

[ ]    —    —

Digestion Log for ICP-MS  
(Form XII) present?

[ ]    —    —

Digestion Log for mercury  
(Form XII) present?

[ ]    —    —

Distillation Log for cyanide  
(Form XII) present?

[ ]    —    —

Are pH values for metals and

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES    NO    N/A

cyanide reported for each  
aqueous sample?

☐    \_    \_

Are percent solids calculations  
present for soils/sediments?

☐    \_    \_

Are preparation dates present on the  
sample preparation logs/bench sheets?

☐    \_    \_

**NOTE:**

Digestion/Distillation log must include weights, volumes,  
and dilutions used to obtain the reported results.

A.1.8.2    Is the analytical instrument  
real-time    printouts present for:

ICP-AES?

☐    \_    \_

ICP-MS?

☐    \_    \_

Mercury?

☐    \_    \_

Cyanide?

☐    \_    \_

Are all laboratory bench sheets  
and instrument raw data printouts  
necessary to support all sample  
analyses and QC operations:

Legible?

☐    \_    \_

Properly labeled?

☐    \_    \_

Are all field samples, QC samples  
and field QC samples present on:

Digestion/Distillation log?

☐    \_    \_

Instrument Printouts?

☐    \_    \_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above questions in  
Section A.1.8.1 and Section A.1.8.2, write  
Telephone Record Log and contact TOPO/PO  
for re-submittal from the laboratory.

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

**A.1.9 Technical Holding Times:** (Aqueous and soil samples)

(Examine sample Traffic Reports and digestion/distillation logs to determine the holding time from the sample collection date to the sample preparation date.)

A.1.9.1      Cyanide distillation(14 days)exceeded?      ☐ ☐ ☐

Mercury analysis(28 days) exceeded?      ☐ ☐ ☐

Other Metals analysis(180 days)exceeded?      ☐ ☐ ☐

**ACTION:**

If yes, reject (R) and red-line non-detects and flag as estimated (J)results  $\geq$  MDL even if sample(s) was preserved properly.

**NOTE:**

In addition to qualifying the data, a list of all samples and analytes which exceeded the holding times must be prepared. Report for each sample the number of days that were exceeded. (Subtract the sample collection date from the sample preparation date). Attach this list to the data review narrative.

A.1.9.2      Is pH of aqueous samples for:

Metals Analysis       $\leq 2$ ?      ☐ ☐ ☐

Cyanide Analysis       $\geq 12$ ?      ☐ ☐ ☐

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, flag non-detects as "R" and detects as "J".

A.1.9.3      Is the cooler temperature  $\leq 10$  C°?      ☐ ☐ ☐

**ACTION:**

If cooler temperature is  $>10$  °C , flag non-detects as "UJ" and detects as "J".

**A.1.10 Final Data Correctness - Form I**

A.1.10.1      Are Form I's for all samples

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES    NO    N/A

present and complete?

[ ]         

**ACTION:**

If no, prepare Telephone Record  
Log and contact CLP PO/TOPO for  
submittal from the laboratory.

A.1.10.2    Verify there are no calculation and transcription errors in the results  
reported on Form I's. Circle on each Form I all results that are incorrect.

Is the calculation error less than 10% of the correct result?    [ ]      

Are results on Form I's reported in correct units (ug/L for aqueous and  
MG/KG for soils)?    [ ]      

Are results on Form I'S reported by    correct significant figures? [ ]      

Are soil sample results on Form I's  
corrected for percent solids?    [ ]      

Are all "less than MDL" values reported  
by the CRQLs and coded with "U"?    [ ]      

Are values less than the CRQLs  
but greater than or equal to the  
MDLs flagged with "J"?    [ ]      

Are appropriate contractual quality  
control and Method qualifiers used?    [ ]      

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above questions,  
prepare Telephone Record Log, and contact  
CLP PO/TOPO for corrected data.

A.1.10.3    Do EPA sample identification numbers  
and the corresponding laboratory  
sample identification numbers match  
on the Cover Page, Form I's and  
in the raw data?

[ ]         

Was a brief physical description

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

of the samples before and after  
digestion given on the Form I's?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

Was any sample result outside the  
mercury/cyanide calibration range  
or the ICP-AES/ICP-MS linear range  
diluted and noted on the Form I?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, note under  
the Contract-Problem/Non-Compliance  
Section of the Data Review Narrative.

**A.1.11 Initial Calibration**

A.1.11.1      Is a record of at least 2 point  
(A blank and a standard)calibration  
present for ICP-AES analysis?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

Is a record of at least 2 point  
(a blank and a standard)calibration  
present for ICP-MS analysis?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

Is a record of at least 5 point calibration  
(a blank & 4 standards)present for Hg analysis?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

Is a record of at least 4 point calibration  
(a blank & 4 standards)present for cyanide?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If incomplete or no initial calibration  
was performed, reject (R) and red-line  
the associated data (detects & non-detects).

Is one initial calibration standard  
at the CRQL level for cyanide and  
mercury?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, write in the Contract Problem/  
Non-Compliance Section of the Data  
Review Narrative .

A.1.11.2      Is the curve correlation  
coefficient  $\geq 0.995$  for:

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Mercury Analysis?	[__]	__	__
Cyanide Analysis?	[__]	__	__
ICP-AES(more than 2 point Calib.)?	[__]	__	__
ICP-MS (more than 2 point calib.)?	[__]	__	__

**ACTION:**

If no, qualify the associated sample results  $\geq$  MDL as estimated "J" and non-detects as "UJ".

**NOTE:**

The correlation coefficient shall be calculated by the data validator using standard concentrations and the corresponding instrument response (e.g. absorbance, peak area, peak height, etc.).

A.1.12      **Initial and Continuing Calibration Verification- Form IIA**

A.1.12.1	Present and complete for every metal and cyanide?	[__]	__	__
	Present and complete for ICP-AES and ICP-MS when both these methods were used for the same analyte?	[__]	__	__

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, prepare a Telephone Record Log and contact PO/TOPO for re-submittal from the laboratory.

A.1.12.2	Was a Continuing Calibration Verification performed every 10 samples or every 2 hours whichever is more frequent?	[__]	__	__
----------	---	------	----	----

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, write in the Contract-Problem/Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review Narrative.

A.1.12.3	Was an ICV or a mid-range standard distilled and analyzed with each batch of cyanide samples?	[__]	__	__
----------	---	------	----	----



SOP: HW-2	Revision 13	Appendix A.1	Sept. 2006		
			YES	NO	N/A

If no for any of the above, write in the Contract-Problem/Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review Narrative and qualify results > MDL as estimated (J).

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

(CRQL or MDL when MDL > CRQL)

standard analyzed?

(Note: CRI is not required for Al, Ba, Ca, Fe, Mg, Na and K.)

YES      NO      N/A

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

For each ICP-MS run, was a CRI (CRQL or MDL when MDL > CRQL) standard analyzed for each mass/isotope used for the analysis?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

For each mercury run, was a CRQL standard analyzed?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

For each cyanide run, was a CRQL standard analyzed?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, write this deficiency in the Contract Problems/ Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review Narrative, inform CLP PO and flag results in the affected ranges (detects <2xCRQL) as J and non-detects UJ.

The affected ranges are:

ICP-AES Analysis - \*True Value  $\pm$  CRQL

ICP-MS Analysis - \*True Value  $\pm$  CRQL

Mercury Analysis - \*True Value  $\pm$  CRQL

Cyanide Analysis - \*True Value  $\pm$  CRQL

\* True value of the CRQL Standard

A.1.13.2      Was a CRQL standard analyzed after the ICV/ICB, before the final CCV/CCB and once every 20 analytical samples in the analytical run for each analysis?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, write in the Contract Problem/ Non-Compliance Section of the "Data Review Narrative".

A.1.13.3      Circle on each Form IIB all percent recoveries that are outside the acceptance windows.

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Is the CRQL standard within control limits for:			
Metals(ICP-AES/ICP-MS)- 70 - 130%?	[ ____ ]	____	____
Mercury- 70 - 130%?	[ ____ ]	____	____
Cyanide - 70 - 130%?	[ ____ ]	____	____

**ACTION:**

If no, flag detects <2xCRQL as "J" and non-detects as "UJ" if the CRQL standard recovery is between 50-69%. Flag(J) only detects <2xCRQL if the recovery is between 131% and ≤180%. If the recovery is less than 150%, reject(R) and red-line non-detects and detects < 2xCRQL, and flag (J) detects between 2xCRQL and ICV/CCV. Reject and red-line only detects <2xCRQL and flag (J) detects ≥ 2xCRQL but < ICV/CCV if the recovery is > 180%.

**NOTE:**

1. Qualify all field samples analyzed between a previous technically acceptable analysis of the CRQL standard and a subsequent acceptable analysis of the CRQL standard
2. Flag (J) or reject (R) only the final sample results on Form I's when **sample raw data** are within the affected ranges and the CRQL standard is outside the acceptance windows.
3. The samples and the CRQL standard must be analyzed in the same analytical run.

**A.1.14 Initial and Continuing Calibration Blanks - Form III**

A.1.14.1	Present and complete for all the instruments used for the metals and cyanide analyses?	[ ____ ]	____	____
	Was an initial Calibration Blank analyzed after ICV?	[ ____ ]	____	____
	Was a continuing Calibration Blank analyzed after every CCV and every 10 samples or every 2 hours, whichever is more frequent?	[ ____ ]	____	____
	Were the ICB & CCB values ≥ MDL but < CRQL reported on Form III and flagged "J" by			

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

using MDLs from direct analysis(Preparation  
Method "NP1")?

[ \_\_\_\_ ]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

(Check Form III against the raw data)

**ACTION:**

If no, inform CLP PO/TOPO and make a note  
in the Contract-Problems/Non-Compliance  
Section of the "Data Review Narrative".

A.1.14.2      Circle with red pencil on each Form III  
all Calib. Blank values that are:

≥ MDL but ≤ CRQL

> CRQL

A.1.14.2.1      When MDL < CRQL, is any Calib. Blank  
value ≥ MDL but ≤ CRQL?

\_\_\_\_      [ \_\_\_\_ ]      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, change sample results ≥ MDL  
but ≤ CRQL to the CRQL with a "U".  
Do not qualify non-detects.

A.1.14.2.2      When MDL < CRQL, is any Calib. Blank  
value > CRQL?

\_\_\_\_      [ \_\_\_\_ ]      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, reject (R) and red line the  
associated sample results > CRQL  
but < ICB/CCB Blank Result. Flag as "J"  
detects > ICB/CCB blank value but  
< 10xICB/CCB value. Change the sample  
results ≥ MDL but ≤ the CRQL to CRQL  
with a "U".

A.1.14.2.3      Is any Calibration Blank value  
below the negative CRQL?

\_\_\_\_      [ \_\_\_\_ ]      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, flag (J) as estimated all  
associated sample results ≥ CRQL but  
< 10xCRQL.

**NOTE:**

1. For ICB that does not meet the technical  
QC Criteria, apply the action to all samples

SOP: HW-2	Revision 13	Appendix A.1	Sept. 2006		
			YES	NO	N/A

2. For CCBs that do not meet the technical QC criteria, apply the action to all samples analyzed between a previous technically acceptable analysis of CCB and a subsequent technically acceptable analysis of the CCB in the analytical run.,

**NOTE:** The Preparation Blank for mercury is the same as the calibration blank.

Each Sample Delivery Group (SDG)?	[__]	__	__
Each batch of the SDG samples digested/distilled?	[__]	__	__
Each matrix type?	[__]	__	__
All instruments used for metals and cyanide analyses?	[__]	__	__

If no for any of the above, flag as estimated (J) all the associated positive data <10xMDL for which the Preparation Blank was not analyzed.

If only one blank was analyzed for more than 20 samples, then the first 20 samples analyzed are not estimated(J),but all additional samples must be qualified (J).

$$\geq \text{MDL} \text{ but } \leq \text{CRQL}, \text{ and}$$

$$> \text{CROL}$$

If yes, change sample result > MDL

Standard Operating Procedure

USEPA Region 2

Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES NO N/A

but  $\leq$  CRQL to CRQL with a "U".

A.1.15.2.2 When the MDL  $\leq$  CRQL, is any Preparation  
Blank value greater than its CRQL?

\_\_\_ [\_\_\_] \_\_\_

If yes, is the Prep. Blank value  
greater than the value of the associated  
Field Blank collected and analyzed with  
the SDG samples?

\_\_\_ [\_\_\_] \_\_\_

If yes, is the lowest concentration of  
that analyte in the associated samples  
less than 10 times the Preparation  
Blank value?

\_\_\_ [\_\_\_] \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, reject (R) and red-line all associated  
sample results greater than the CRQL but less  
than the Prep.Blank value. Flag as "J"  
detects > Prep. Blank value but <10xPrep.Blank.  
If the sample result  $\geq$  MDL but  $\leq$  CRQL, replace  
it with CRQL-U.

If the Prep. Blank value is less than the same  
analyte value in the Field Blank, do not  
qualify the sample results due to the  
Prep. Blank criteria.

**NOTE:**

Convert soil sample result to mg/Kg on  
wet weight basis to compare with the soil  
Prep. Blank result on Form III.

A.1.15.2.3 Is the Prep. Blank concentration  
below the negative CRQL?

\_\_\_ [\_\_\_] \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, flag (J) all associated  
sample results less than 10xCRQL.  
Qualify non-detects as estimated (UJ).

A.1.15.2.4 When the MDL is greater than the  
CRQL, is the preparation blank  
concentration on Form III greater  
than two times the MDL?

\_\_\_ [\_\_\_] \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

If yes, reject (R) and red-line all positive sample results with sample raw data less than 10 times the Preparation Blank value.

**A.1.16      ICP-AES/ICP-MS Interference Check Sample (ICS)- Form IV**

**NOTE:**Not required for CN, Hg, Al, Ca, Fe and Mg.

A.1.16.1      Present and complete?      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

Was ICS analyzed at the beginning and end of each analytical run, and once for every 20 analytical samples?      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

Was ICS analyzed at the beginning of the ICP-MS analytical run?      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, flag as estimated (J) all sample results.

**A.1.16.2      ICP-AES Method**

**A.1.16.2.1      ICSA Solution:**

For ICP-AES, are the ICSA "Found" analyte values within the control limits  $\pm$  of CRQL of the true/established mean value?      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

If no for any of the above, is the sample concentration of Al, Ca, Fe, or Mg in the same units (ug/L or MG/KG) greater than or equal to its respective concentration in the ICSA Solution on Form IV?      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, apply the following action to all samples analyzed between a previous technically acceptable analysis of the ICS and a subsequent technically acceptable analysis of the ICS in the analytical run:

Flag (J) as estimated only sample results  $\geq$ MDL

**Standard Operating Procedure**

USEPA Region 2

Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

for which the ICSA "Found" value is greater than (True value+CRQL). Do not qualify non-detects. If the ICSA "Found" value is less than (True value-CRQL), flag non-detects as "UJ" and detects as "J".

**A.1.16.2.3 ICSAB Solution**

For ICP-AES, are all analyte results in ICSAB within the control limits of 80-120 of the true/established mean value?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

If no for any of the above, is the sample concentration of Al, Ca, Fe, or Mg in the same units (ug/L or MG/KG) greater than or equal to its respective concentration in the ICSAB Solution on Form IV?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, apply the following action to all samples analyzed between a previous technically acceptable analysis of the ICS and a subsequent technically acceptable analysis of the ICS in the analytical run:

Flag (J) as estimated those associated sample results  $\geq$  MDL for which the ICSAB analyte recovery is greater than 120% but  $\leq$  150%. If the ICSAB recovery falls within 50-79%, qualify sample results  $\geq$  MDL as "J" and non-detects as "UJ". Reject (R) and red-line all sample results (detects & non-detects) for which the ICSAB analyte recovery is less than 50%. If the recovery is above 150%, reject (R) and red-line only positive results.

**A.1.16.3 ICP-MS Method**

**A.1.16.3.1 ICSA Solution:**

For ICP-MS, are the ICSA "Found" analyte values within the control limits of  $\pm$ CRQL of the true/established mean value?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, apply the following action to all samples reported from the analytical run:

Flag (J) as estimated only sample results  $\geq$  MDL if the ICSA "Found" value is greater than (True value+CRQL). Do not qualify non-detects. If the ICSA "Found" value is less than (True value-CRQL), flag the associated sample detects as "J" and non-detects as "UJ".



Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

A.1.16.3.3 **ICSAB Solution**

For ICP-MS, are all analyte results in ICSAB within the control limits of 80-120% of the true/established mean value, whichever is greater?

[\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, apply the following action to all samples reported from the analytical run:

Flag (J) as estimated those associated sample results  $\geq$  MDL for which the ICSAB analyte recovery is greater than 120% but  $\leq$  150%. If the ICSAB recovery falls within 50-79% flag (J) as estimated the associated sample results  $\geq$  MDL. Reject (R) and red-line those all sample detects and non-detects for which the ICSAB analyte recovery is less than 50%. If the recovery is above 150%, reject (R) and red-line only detects ( $\geq$  MDL).

A.1.17      **Spiked Sample Recovery: Pre-Digestion/Pre-Distillation)-Form V A**  
**Note:**Not required for Ca,Mg,K,and Na(both matrices);Al and Fe (soil only)

A.1.17.1      Was Matrix Spike analysis performed:

For each matrix type?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

For each SDG?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

On one of the SDG samples?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

For each concentration range (i.e., low, med., high)?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

For each analytical Method (ICP-AES, ICP-MS, Hg, CN) used?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

Was a spiked sample prepared and analyzed with the SDG samples?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, flag as estimated(J)all the positive data for which a spiked sample was not analyzed.

**NOTE:**

If more than one spiked sample were analyzed for one SDG, then qualify the associated data based on the worst spiked sample analysis.

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

A.1.17.2      Was a field blank or PE sample used  
for the spiked sample analysis?

\_\_\_      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, flag (J) as estimated positive data of the associated SDG samples for which field blank or PE sample was used for the spiked sample analysis.

A.1.17.3      Circle on each Form VA all spike recoveries that are outside the control limits (75-125%) that have sample concentrations less than four times the added spike concentrations.

Are all recoveries within the control limits when sample concentrations are less than or equal to four times the spike concentrations?

[\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

**NOTE:**

Disregard the out of control spike recoveries for analytes whose concentrations are greater than or equal to four times the spike added.

Are results outside the control limits (75-125%) flagged with Lab Qualifier "N" on Form I's and Form VA?

[\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, write in the Contract - Problems/Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review Narrative.

A.1.17.4      **Aqueous**

Are any spike recoveries:

(a) less than 30%?

\_\_\_      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_

(b) between 30-74%?

\_\_\_      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_

(c) between 126-150%?

\_\_\_      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_

(d) greater than 150%?

\_\_\_      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If the matrix spike recovery is less than 30%, reject (R) and red-line all associated aqueous data (detects & non-detects). If between 30-74%, qualify all associated aqueous data  $\geq$  MDL as "J" and non-detects

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

as "UJ". If between 126-150%, flag (J)  
all data  $\geq$  MDL as "J". If greater than 150%,  
reject (R) and red-line all associated data  $\geq$  MDL.

(NOTE: Replace "N" with "J", "R" as appropriate.)

**A.1.17.5      Soil/Sediment**

Are any spike recoveries:

(a) less than 10%?	___	[___]	___
(b) between 10-74%?	___	[___]	___
(c) between 126-200%?	___	[___]	___
(d) greater than 200%?	___	[___]	___

**ACTION:**

If yes for any of the above, proceed  
as follows:

If the matrix spike recovery is less  
than 10%, reject (R) and red-line all  
associated data (detects & non-detects);  
if between 10-74%, qualify all associated  
data  $\geq$  MDL as "J" and non-detects as "UJ";  
if between 126-200%, flag (J) all associated  
data  $\geq$  MDL as "J" If greater than 200%, reject  
(R) and red-line all associated data  $\geq$  MDL.  
(NOTE: Replace "N" with "J" or "R" as appropriate.)

**A.1.18      Lab Duplicates) - Form VI**

**A.1.18.1      Was the lab duplicate analysis performed:**

For each SDG?	[___]	___	___
On one of the SDG samples?	[___]	___	___
For each matrix type?	[___]	___	___
For each concentration range (low or med.)?	[___]	___	___
For each analytical Method (ICP-AES/ICP-MS, Hg, CN) Used?	[___]	___	___
Was a lab duplicate prepared and analyzed with the SDG samples?	[___]	___	___

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES    NO    N/A

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, flag (J) as estimated all the SDG sample results (detects & non-detects) for which the lab duplicate analysis was not performed.

**NOTE:**

If more than one lab duplicate sample were analyzed for an SDG, then qualify the associated samples based on the worst lab duplicate analysis.

A.1.18.2    Was a Field Blank or PE sample used for the Lab Duplicate analysis?

\_\_\_\_\_ [\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, flag as estimated (J) all SDG sample results (hits & non-detects) for which Field Blank or PE sample was used for duplicate analysis.

A.1.18.3    Circle on each Form VI all values that are:

RPD > 20%, or

Absolute Difference > CRQL

Are all values within control limits ( $RPD \leq 20\%$  or absolute difference  $\leq \pm CRQL$ )?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_\_

If no, are all results outside the control limits flagged with an "\*" (Lab Qualifier) on Form VI and on all Form I's?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, write in the Contract-Problems/ Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review Narrative.

**NOTE:**

The laboratory is not required to report on Form VI the RPD when both values are non-detects.

A.1.18.4    **Aqueous**

A.1.18.4.1    When sample and duplicate values are both  $\geq 5 \times CRQL$  (substitute MDL for CRQL when  $MDL > CRQL$ ),

Standard Operating Procedure

USEPA Region 2

Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>
is any RPD > 20% but < 100%?	___	[___]	___
is any RPD $\geq$ 100%?	___	[___]	___

**ACTION:**

If the RPD is > 20% but < 100%,  
flag (J) as estimated the associated  
sample data  $\geq$  CRQL. If the RPD is  
 $\geq$  100%, reject (R) and red-line the  
associated sample data  $\geq$  CRQL.

(NOTE: Replace "" with "J" or "R" as appropriate.)

A.1.18.4.2 When the sample and/or duplicate value  
<5xCRQL (substitute MDL for CRQL when MDL >CRQL),  
is the absolute difference between sample  
and duplicate values:

> $\pm$ CRQL?	___	[___]	___
> $\pm$ 2xCRQL?	___	[___]	___

**ACTION:**

If the absolute difference is > CRQL,  
flag as estimated all the associated  
sample results  $\geq$  MDL but < 5xCRQL as "J"  
and non-detects as "UJ". If the absolute  
difference is > 2xCRQL, reject (R) and  
red-line all the associated non-detects  
and detects  $\geq$  MDL but < 5xCRQL.

**NOTE:**

1. Replace "" with "J", "UJ" or "R" as appropriate.)
2. If one value is >CRQL and the other value is non-detect,  
calculate the absolute difference between the value > CRQL  
and the MDL, and use this difference to qualify sample results.

A.1.18.5 **Soil/Sediment**

A.1.18.5.1 When sample and duplicate values  
are both  $\geq$  5xCRQL (substitute MDL for  
CRQL when MDL > CRQL),

is any RPD $\geq$ 35% but < 120%?	___	[___]	___
is any RPD $\geq$ 120%?	___	[___]	___

**ACTION:**

If the RPD is  $\geq$  35% and < 120%, flag  
(J) as estimated the associated sample

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

data  $\geq$  CRQL. If the RPD is  $\geq$  120%, reject (R) and red-line the associated sample data  $\geq$  CRQL.

A.1.18.5.2 When the sample and/or duplicate value  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  (substitute MDL for CRQL when MDL  $>$  CRQL), is the absolute difference between sample and duplicate:

$> \pm 2 \times \text{CRQL}$ ?                  [        ]            

$> \pm 4 \times \text{CRQL}$                   [        ]            

**ACTION:**

If the absolute difference is  $> 2 \times \text{CRQL}$ , flag all the associated sample results  $\geq$  MDL but  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  as "J" and non-detects as "UJ". If the absolute difference is  $> 4 \times \text{CRQL}$ , reject (R) and red-line all the associated non-detects and detects  $\geq$  MDL but  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$ .

**NOTE:**

1. Replace "\*" with "J", "UJ" or "R" as appropriate.)
2. If one value is  $> \text{CRQL}$  and the other value is non-detect, calculate the absolute difference between the value  $>$  CRQL and the MDL, and use this difference to qualify sample results.

A.1.19      **Field Duplicates**

**Aqueous Field Duplicates**

A.1.19.1 Was an aqueous Field Duplicate pair collected and analyzed?      [        ]                          
(Check Sampling Trip Report)

**ACTION:**

If yes, prepare a Form (Appendix A.4) for each aqueous Field Duplicate pair. Report the sample and Field Duplicate results on Appendix A.4 from their respective Form I's. Calculate and report RPD on Appendix A.4 when sample and its Field Duplicate values are both  $> 5 \times \text{CRQL}$ . Calculate and report the absolute difference on Appendix A.4 when at least one value (sample or duplicate) is  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$ . Evaluate the aqueous Field Duplicate analysis in accordance with the

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
**USEPA Region 2**  
**Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program**  
**Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review**

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

QC criteria stated in Sections A.1.19.2 and A.1.19.3.

**NOTE:**

1. Do not transfer "\*" from Form I's to Appendix A.4.
2. Do not calculate RPD when both values are non-detects.
3. Substitute MDL for CRQL when MDL > CRQL.
4. If one value is >CRQL and the other value is non-detect, calculate the absolute difference between the value > CRQL and the MDL, and use this the criteria to qualify the results.

A.1.19.2      Circle all values on the Form (Appendix A.4) for Field Duplicates that have:

RPD  $\geq$  20%      or

Difference  $> \pm$  CRQL

When sample and duplicate values are both  $\geq 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  (substitute MDL for CRQL when MDL > CRQL),

is any RPD  $\geq$  20%?                  [      ]            

is any RPD  $\geq$  100%?                  [      ]            

**ACTION:**

If the RPD is >20% but < 100%, flag (J) only the associated sample and its Field Duplicate results  $\geq$  CRQL. If the RPD is  $\geq$  100%, reject(R) and red-line only the associated sample and its Field Duplicate result  $\geq$  CRQL.

A.1.19.3      When the sample and/or duplicate value(s)  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  (substitute MDL for CRQL when MDL > CRQL), is the absolute difference between sample and duplicate:

$> \pm$  CRQL?                  [      ]            

$> \pm 2 \times \text{CRQL}$ ?                  [      ]            

**ACTION:**

If the absolute difference is  $> \text{CRQL}$ , flag detects  $\geq$  MDL but  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  as "J" and non-detects as "UJ". If the difference is  $> 2 \times \text{CRQL}$ , reject (R) and red-line non-detects

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

and results  $\geq$  MDL but  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  of the sample  
and its Field Duplicate.

**Soil/Sediment Field Duplicates**

A.1.19.4      Was a soil field duplicate pair  
collected and analyzed?      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_  
(Check Sampling Trip Report)

**ACTION:**

If yes, for each soil Field Duplicate  
pair proceed as follows:

Prepare Appendix A.4 for each Field Duplicate  
pair. Report on Appendix A.4 all sample and its  
Field Duplicate results in MG/KG from their  
respective Form I's. Calculate and report RPD when  
sample and its duplicate values are both greater  
than  $5 \times \text{CRQL}$ . Calculate and report the  
absolute difference when at least one value  
(sample or duplicate) is  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$ . Evaluate the  
Field Duplicate analysis in accordance with the  
QC Criteria stated in Sections A.1.19.5 and A.1.19.6.

**NOTE:**

1. Do not transfer "\*" from Form I's to Appendix A.4.
2. Do not calculate RPD when both values are non-detects.
3. Substitute MDL for CRQL when  $\text{MDL} > \text{CRQL}$ .
4. If one value is  $> \text{CRQL}$  and the other  
value is non-detect, calculate the  
absolute difference between the  
value  $> \text{CRQL}$  and the MDL, and apply  
the criteria to qualify the results.

A.1.19.5      Circle on each Appendix A.4 all  
values that have:

RPD  $\geq 35\%$ , or Difference  $> \pm 2 \times \text{CRQL}$   
When sample and duplicate values  
are both  $\geq 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  (substitute MDL for  
CRQL when  $\text{MDL} > \text{CRQL}$ ),

is any RPD  $\geq 35\%$  but  $< 120\%$ ?      \_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

is any RPD  $\geq 120\%$ ?      \_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If the RPD is  $\geq 35\%$  but  $< 120\%$ ,



**Standard Operating Procedure**  
**USEPA Region 2**  
**Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program**  
**Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review**

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

flag only the associated sample  
and its Field Duplicate results  
 $\geq$  CRQL as "J". If the RPD is  $\geq$  120%,  
reject (R) and red-line only the sample  
and its Field Duplicate results  $\geq$  CRQL.

A.1.19.6      When the sample and/or duplicate value(s)  
 $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  (substitute MDL for CRQL when MDL  $>$  CRQL),  
is the absolute difference between sample  
and Field Duplicate:

$> \pm 2 \times \text{CRQL?}$                   [        ]            

$> \pm 4 \times \text{CRQL?}$                   [        ]            

**ACTION:**

If the absolute difference is  $> 2 \times \text{CRQL}$ , flag  
Sample and its Field Duplicate results  $\geq$  MDL  
but  $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  as "J" and non-detects as "UJ".  
If the difference is  $> 4 \times \text{CRQL}$ , reject (R) and  
red-line non-detects and detects  $\geq$  MDL but  
 $< 5 \times \text{CRQL}$  of the sample and its Field Duplicate.

A.1.20      **Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)- Form VII**

A.1.20.1      Was one LCS prepared and analyzed for:

Each SDG?      [        ]                        

Each matrix type?      [        ]                        

Each batch samples digested/distilled?  
For each Method(ICP-AES, ICP-MS, Hg, CN)  
used?      [        ]                        

Was an LCS prepared and analyzed with  
the samples?      [        ]                        

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, prepare  
Telephone Record Log and contact  
CLP PO or TOPO for submittal of the  
LCS results. Flag (J) as estimated all  
the data for which an LCS was not  
analyzed.

**NOTE:**

If only one LCS was analyzed for

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

more than 20 samples, then the first  
20 samples analyzed are not flagged(J),  
but all additional samples must be  
qualified (J).

A.1.20.2      **Aqueous LCS**

Circle on each Form VII the LCS percent  
recoveries outside control limits 80-120%.

**NOTE:** 1.Use digested ICV as LCS for aqueous mercury  
2.Use distilled ICV as LCS for aqueous cyanide

Is any LCS recovery:

Less than 50%?      \_\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_\_

Between 50% and 79%?      \_\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_\_

Between 121% and 150%?      \_\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_\_

Greater than 150%?      \_\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If the LCS recovery is less than 50%,  
reject (R) and red-line all associated  
sample data (detects & non-detects); for  
a recovery between 50-79%, flag detects  
as "J" all non-detects as "UJ". if the LCS  
recovery is between 121-150%, flag only  
detects as "J". if the recovery is greater  
than 150%, reject (R) and red-line all detects.

A.1.20.3      **Solid LCS**

If an analyte's MDL is equal to or  
greater than the true value of LCS,  
disregard the "Action" below for that  
analyte even though the LCS is out of  
control limits.

Is the LCS "Found" value greater  
than the Upper Control Limit  
reported on Form VII?      \_\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

YES      NO      N/A

If yes, flag (J) all the associated  
detects  $\geq$  MDL as estimated (J).

Is the LCS "Found" value lower  
than the Lower Control Limit  
reported on Form VII?

\_\_\_\_ [\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, flag detects as "J" and  
non-detects as "UJ".

**A.1.21      ICP-AES/ICP-MS Serial Dilution - Form VIII**

**NOTE:** Serial dilution analysis is required only  
when the initial concentration is equal to or  
greater than 50 x MDL.

**A.1.21.1      Was a Serial Dilution analysis  
performed:**

For each SDG?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

On one of the SDG samples?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

For each matrix type?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

For each concentration range  
(low or med.)?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

Was a Serial Dilution sample  
analyzed with the SDG samples?

[\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, flag  
as estimated (J) detects  $\geq$  MDL of  
all the SDG samples for which the  
ICP Serial Dilution Analysis was  
not performed.

**A.1.21.2      Was a Field Blank or PE sample used  
for the Serial Dilution Analysis?**

\_\_\_\_ [\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, flag as estimated (J) detects  
 $\geq$  MDL of all the SDG samples

**A.1.21.3      Circle on Form VIII the Percent Differences  
(%D) between sample results and its dilution  
results that are outside the control limits  $\pm 10\%$**

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

when initial concentrations  $\geq 50 \times$  MDLs.

YES      NO      N/A

Are results outside the control  
limits flagged with an "E"(Lab Qualifier)  
on Form VIII and all Form I's?

[\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, write in the Contract-Problem/  
Non-Compliance Section of the Data  
Review Narrative.

A.1.21.4      Are any %D values:

> 10%?

\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

$\geq 100\%$ ?

\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If the Percent Difference (%D) is  
greater than 10%, flag (J) as estimated  
all associated samples whose **raw data**  $\geq$  MDL;  
if the %D is  $\geq 100\%$ , reject (R) and red-line  
all associated samples with **raw data**  $\geq$  MDL.

(NOTE: Replace "E" with "J" or "R" as appropriate.)

A.1.22      **Total/Dissolved or Inorganic/Total Analytes**

A.1.22.1      Were any analyses performed for  
dissolved as well as total analytes  
on the same sample(s)?

\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

Were any analyses performed for  
inorganic as well as total analytes  
on the same sample(s)?

\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If yes, prepare a Form (Appendix A.5)  
to compare the differences between  
dissolved (or inorganic) and total  
analyte concentrations. Compute each  
difference on Appendix A.5 as a percent  
of the total analyte only when both of  
the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (1) The dissolved (or inorganic) concentration  
is greater than total concentration, and
- (2) greater than or equal to  $5 \times$  MDL.

A.1.22.2      Is any dissolved (or inorganic)  
concentration greater than its  
total concentration by more than 20%?

\_\_\_\_      [\_\_\_\_]      \_\_\_\_

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

YES      NO      N/A

A.1.22.3      Is any dissolved(or inorganic)  
concentration greater than its  
total concentration by more than 50%?                  [      ]            

**ACTION:**

If the percent difference is greater than 20%, flag (J) both dissolved/inorganic and total concentrations as estimated. If the difference is more than 50%, reject (R) and red-line both the values.

A.1.23      **Field Blank - Form I**  
**NOTE: Designate "Field Blank" as such on Form I**

A.1.23.1      Was a Field/Rinsate Bank collected  
and analyzed with the SDG samples?      [      ]                        

If yes, is any Field/Rinsate Blank  
absolute value of an analyte on Form I  
greater than its CRQL(or 2xMDL when MDL>CRQL)?                  [      ]            

If yes, circle the Field Blank value  
on Form I that is greater than the  
CRQL,(or 2 x MDL when MDL > CRQL).  
  
Is any Field Blank value greater  
than CRQL also greater than the  
Preparation Blank value?                  [      ]            

If yes, is the Field Blank value  
(> CRQL and > the prep. blank value)  
already rejected due to other QC  
criteria?      [      ]                        

**ACTION:**

If the Field Blank value was not rejected,  
reject all associated sample data (except  
the Field Blank results)greater than the  
CRQL but less than the Field Blank value.  
Reject on Form I's the soil sample results  
whose raw values in ug/L in the instrument  
printout are greater than the CRQL but less  
than the Field Blank value in ug/L. Flag as  
"J" detects between the Field Blank value and  
10xField Blank value. If the sample result  $\geq$  MDL  
but  $\leq$  CRQL, replace it with CRQL-U.

If the Field Blank value is less than the

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

---

Prep.Blank value, do not qualify the sample results due to the Field Blank criteria.

YES      NO      N/A

**NOTE:**

1. Field Blank result previously rejected due to other criteria cannot be used to qualify field samples.
2. Do not use Rinsate Blank associated with soils to qualify water samples and vice versa.

**A.1.24      Verification of Instrumental Parameters - Form IX, XA, XB, XI**

A.1.24.1      Is verification report present for:

Method Detection Limits (Form IX-Annually)?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

ICP-AES Interelement Correction Factors  
(Form XA & XB -Quarterly)?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

ICP-AES & ICP-MS Linear Ranges  
(Form XI-Quarterly)?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no, contact CLP PO/TOPO for submittal from the laboratory.

**A.1.24.2      Method Detection Limits - Form IX**

A.1.24.2.1      Are MDLs present on Form IX for:

All the analytes?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

All the instruments used?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

Digested and undigested  
samples and Calib.Blanks?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

ICP-AES and ICP-MS when both  
instruments are used for the  
same analyte?      [\_\_\_]      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

**ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, prepare Telephone Record Log and contact CLP PO/TOPO for submittal of the MDLs from the laboratory. Report to CLP PO and write in the Contract Problems/Non-Compliance Section of the Data Review Narrative if the MDL concentration is not less than ½ CRQL.

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13      Appendix A.1      Sept. 2006

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>
A.1.24.2.2 Is MDL greater than the CRQL for any analyte?	___	[___]	___
If yes, is the analyte concentration on Form I greater than 5 x MDL for the sample analyzed on the instrument whose MDL exceeds CRQL?	[___]	___	___
<b><u>ACTION:</u></b>			
If no, flag as estimated (J) all values less than five times MDL for the analyte whose MDL exceeds the CRQL.			
 A.1.24.3 <b><u>Linear Ranges - Form XI</u></b>			
A.1.24.3.1 Was any sample result higher than the high linear range for ICP-AES or ICP-MS?	___	[___]	___
Was any sample result higher than the highest calibration standard for mercury or cyanide?	___	[___]	___
If yes for any of the above, was the sample diluted to obtain the result reported on Form I?	[___]	___	___
<b><u>ACTION:</u></b>			
If no, flag (J) as estimated the affected detects ( $\geq$ MDL) reported on Form I.			
 A.1.25 <b><u>ICP-MS Tune Analysis - Form XIV</u></b>			
A.1.25.1 Was the ICP-MS instrument tuned prior to calibration?	[___]	___	___
<b><u>ACTION:</u></b>			
If no, reject (R) and red-line all sample data for which tuning was not performed.			
A.1.25.2 Was the tuning solution analyzed or scanned at least five times consecutively?	[___]	___	___
Were all the required isotopes spanning the analytical range present in the tuning solution?	[___]	___	___
Was the mass resolution within			

# Standard Operating Procedure

USEPA Region 2

## Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

YES NO N/A

0.1 amu for each isotope in the  
tuning solution?

[ ]          

Was %RSD less than 5% for each  
isotope of each analyte in the  
tuning solution?

[ ]          

### **ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, qualify  
all results  $\geq$  MDL associated with that  
Tune as estimated "J", and all non-detects  
associated with that Tune as "UJ".

### A.1.26 **ICP-MS Internal Standards - Form XV**

A.1.26.1 Were the Internal Standards added  
to all the samples and all QC  
samples and calibration standards  
(except the Tuning Solution)?

[ ]          

Were all the target analyte  
masses bracketed by the masses  
of the five internal standards?

[ ]          

### **ACTION:**

If none of the Internal Standards was  
added to the samples, reject (R) and  
red-line all the associated sample data  
(detects & non-detects). If internal  
standards were used but did not cover all  
the analyte masses, reject (R) and red-line  
only the analyte results not bracketed by  
the internal standard masses.

A.1.26.2 Was the intensity of an Internal  
Standard in each sample within 60-125%  
of the intensity of the same Internal  
Standard in the calibration blank?

[ ]          

If no, was the original sample diluted  
two fold, Internal Standard added and the  
sample re-analyzed?

[ ]          

Was the %RI for the two fold diluted sample  
within the acceptance limits (60-125%)?

[ ]          

### **ACTION:**

If no for any of the above, flag detects  
as "J" and non-detects "UJ" of all the  
analytes with atomic masses between the

atomic mass of the internal standard lighter



## Standard Operating Procedure

USEPA Region 2

### Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.2

Sept. 2006

than the affected internal standard, and the  
atomic mass of the internal standard heavier  
than the affected internal standard.

#### A.1.27 Percent Solids of Sediments

A.1.27.1 Are percent solids in sediment(s):

< 50%? \_\_\_\_\_ [\_\_\_\_] \_\_\_\_\_

##### ACTION:

If yes, qualify as estimated (J) all detects and  
non-detects of a sample that has percent solids  
less than 50%(i.e.,moisture content greater than 50%).

##### NOTE:

Flag(J) only the sample results  
that were not previously flagged  
due to other QC criteria.

### Inorganic Data Review Narrative

Case# \_\_\_\_\_ Site: \_\_\_\_\_ Matrix: Soil \_\_\_\_\_  
SDG# \_\_\_\_\_ Lab: \_\_\_\_\_ Water \_\_\_\_\_  
Sampling Team: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

#### A.2.1 Data Validation Flags:

The following flags may have been applied in red by the data validator and must  
be considered by the data user.

J - This flag indicates the result qualified as **estimated**

R and Red-Line - A red-line drawn through a sample result indicates **unusable** value.  
The red-lined data are known to contain significant errors based on  
documented information and must not be used by the data user.

U - This data validation qualifier is applied to sample results  
≥ MDL when associated blank is contaminated

Fully Usable Data - The results that do not carry "J" or "red-line" are fully  
usable.

#### A.2.2 Laboratory Qualifiers:

The CLP laboratory applies a contractual qualifier on all

Standard Operating Procedure

USEPA Region 2

Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.2

Sept. 2006

Form I'S and the QC Form when a QC analysis is outside the control limits. These qualifiers are not applied on the Lotus or XLS spreadsheets. These qualifiers and their meanings are as follows:

**N:** This qualifier indicates the lack of accuracy in the reported result, and is applied when matrix spiked sample recovery is outside the control limits.

**E:** This qualifier indicates the the presence of interference, and is applied when the ICP serial dilution is outside the control limits.

**\***: This qualifier indicate the lack of precision , and is pplied on Fom I'S and Form VI when the Lab Duplicate analysis is outside the control limits.

**U:** This is a concentration qualifier that laboratory applies to a non-detected result which is essentially less than the Method Detection Limit(MDL). A non-detected result of an analyte is indicated by the Contract Required Quantitation Limit (CRQL) of that analyte suffixed with "U".

**J:** This is also a concentration qualifier that laboratory applies to a positive result below the CRQL.

**NOTE:** The laboratory qualifiers are crossed out and replaced with the appropriate data validation qualifiers (J, R or U) by the data validator.

A.2.3.1 Data Case Description:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

A.2.3.2 CSF Audit:

---

---

---

---

Standard Operating Procedure

USEPA Region 2

Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.2

Sept. 2006

A.2.3.3 **Technical Review:**

A.2.3.4 **Contract-Problem/Non-Compliance:**

**Standard Operating Procedure**

USEPA Region 2

Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program

Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2 Revision 13

Appendix A.2

Sept. 2006

---

HWSS Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Contractor  
Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Verified by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

**Contract Laboratory Program  
REGION II/LABORATORY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM**

**Telephone Record Log**

CASE #

SDG #

Date of Call: \_\_\_\_\_

ESAT Reviewer/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Analysis: \_\_\_\_\_Inorganic\_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Lab Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Call Initiated By: \_\_\_Laboratory \_\_\_X\_Region II

Inquiry made in reference to data for the following sample number(s):

Summary of Questions/Issues Discussed:

Summary of Resolution:

**Standard Operating Procedure**  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2    Revision 13

Appendix A.2

Sept. 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FIELD    DUPLICATES**

**Sample No.**

**Field Duplicate No.**

**Sample Matrix:**

**Lab Code:**

**Case No. :**

**SDG No.:**

**% Solids Sample:**

**% Solids Duplicate:**

**Concentration Units (ug/l or mg/kg dry weight):**

	<b>Action Limit</b>	<b>Sample Concentration</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Duplicate Concentration</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>RPD</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>M</b>
<b>Aluminum</b>									
<b>Antimony</b>									
<b>Arsenic</b>									
<b>Barium</b>									
<b>Beryllium</b>									
<b>Cadmium</b>									
<b>Calcium</b>									
<b>Chromium</b>									
<b>Cobalt</b>									
<b>Copper</b>									
<b>Iron</b>									
<b>Lead</b>									
<b>Magnesium</b>									
<b>Manganese</b>									

Standard Operating Procedure  
USEPA Region 2  
Evaluation of Metals Data for the Contract Laboratory Program  
Data Assessment and Contract Compliance Review

SOP: HW-2      Revision 13

Appendix A.1

Sept. 2006

					YES	NO	N/A		
Mercury									
Nickel									
Potassium									
Selenium									
Silver									
Sodium									
Thallium									
Vanadium									
Zinc									
Cyanide									

**Total/Dissolved Concentrations**

Lab Code

Case No.

SDG No.

Sample Matrix: Water

Concentration: ug/L

ANALYTE	TOTAL	C	DISSOLVED	C	DIFFERENCE	Q	M
ALUMINUM							
ARSENIC							
BARIUM							
BERYLLIUM							
CADMIUM							
CALCIUM							
CHROMIUM							
COBALT							
COPPER							
IRON							
LEAD							
MAGNESIUM							
MAGNESE							
MERCURY							
NICKEL							

POTASSIUM							
SELENIUM							
SILVER							
SODIUM							
THALLIUM							
VANADIUM							
ZINC							
CYANIDE							

**CONTRACT LABORATORY PROGRAM  
CLP RAS RE-ANALYSIS REQUEST/APPROVAL RECORD**

**SECTION A** (TO BE COMPLETED BY REGIONAL SENDING OFFICIAL)

**Initiated By:**

Name, Affiliation, Phone Number

\_\_\_\_\_

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

! OLM

! OLC

! ILM

Details of Re-Analysis Request:

! Laboratory Name /Contract Number: \_\_\_\_\_

! Affected Sample Number(s) and Fraction(s): \_\_\_\_\_

! Reason for Re-Analysis: \_\_\_\_\_

! Contract Statement of Work Citation\*: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

! Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

! \* PROVIDE SOW CITATION THAT SUPPORTS THIS REQUEST

**RE-ANALYSIS**

Billable

( )

Not Billable

( )

! Approved By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Regional Sending CLP PO Signature

**SECTION B** (TO BE COMPLETED BY SMO)

Name of SMO Contact \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Laboratory Notification (Verbal): \_\_\_\_\_

Re-analysis Start Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Data Due Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Return completed form to:  
Sample Management Office (SMO)

**Distribution:** (1) CLP PO Copy (2) Regional Sending Official Copy (3) SMO File Copy (4) Laboratory Copy  
**Final 9/3/99**

### CLP DATA ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FORM (INORGANICS)

Type of Review: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Case# \_\_\_\_\_SDG#\_\_\_\_\_

Site: \_\_\_\_\_ Lab Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Initials: \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Samples: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Analytes Rejected (R) Due to Exceeding Review Criteria

	Holding Time	CRQL Std	Blanks	ICS	Spike Recovery	Dup. Lab.	Dup. Field	LCS	ICP Serial Dilution	% Solids	Internal Std. ICP-MS	Tuning ICP-MS	Total Analytes	Rejection %
ICP-AES														
ICP-MS														
Mercury														
Cyanide														
Total														

#### Analytes Flagged (J) as Estimated Due to Exceeding Review Criteria



[illegible]